

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

There are no formal matters pending.

Applicant appreciates the clear response to arguments provided in the Official Action. The Examiner's kind attention in responding to applicant's last arguments is greatly appreciated as this aids applicant in focusing an appropriate response.

The Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 14, 15, 17 and 19 stand rejected as anticipated by FERNANDEZ, WO 99/65256.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, and 18 stand rejected as obvious over FERNANDEZ in view of SCANNELL et al. 5,377,354.

SCANNELL is offered for showing the receiver registering electronic mail in a priority order so that the received electronic mail can be rearranged for the receiver.

Claim 10 stands rejected as obvious over FERNANDEZ in view of NELSON 6,061,718.

NELSON is offered for showing the conversion of text into voice.

Claims 20, 22, 25 and 26 stand rejected as obvious over FERNANDEZ in view of CHONG et al. 5,497,319; Claims 21, 23, 27

and 28 stand rejected as obvious over FERNANDEZ and SCANNELL et al. in view of CHONG et al.

Claim 24 is stated (OA page 12) to stand rejected as obvious over SCANNELL et al. in view of CHONG et al. Claim 24, however, depends from claim 5. Therefore, it is believed that the rejection is actually over FERNANDEZ in view of SCANNELL et al. in further view of CHONG et al.

Claim 29 is stated (OA page 13) to stand rejected as obvious over NELSON in view of CHONG et al. Claim 29, however, depends from claim 10. Therefore, it is believed that the rejection is actually over FERNANDEZ in view of NELSON in further view of CHONG et al.

CHONG is offered for showing a conversion processor between a PC and a mobile device.

Why the Claims are Allowable

In the second full paragraph of Official Action page 3, it is stated that applicant's arguments were not recited in the rejected claim(s).

See that original claim 3 recited "the keywords are individual keywords including dates, place names, proper names and individually set particular terms, and group keywords including an occupation, an occupational type and an age group of an electronic mail sender and receiver".

More specifically, the last amendment revised claim 3 to recite (emphasis added):

"an analysis means for receiving the electronic mail sent from the first sending means via the internet and for carrying out a keyword analysis of the received electronic mail on the basis of keywords previously registered by the receiver to obtain a short text of a message portion of the electronic mail, the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to retain text corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words not corresponding to the registered keywords;

...

"the keywords are individual keywords including dates, place names, proper names and individually set particular terms, and group keywords including an occupation, an occupational type and an age group of an electronic mail sender and receiver".

Applicant understands the essence of the current rejections (as to FERNANDEZ) to be that the limitation "keyword" can be read onto a numeric value representing a maximum message length limit (FERNANDEZ page 5, lines 5-15), e.g., 100 characters.

This numeric value is registered before obtaining the email and is used to truncate the email to the specified length. Thus, the truncated length of the FERNANDEZ email is said (by the Official Action) to satisfy selectively shortening the message

portion to retain text corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words not corresponding to the registered keywords in that the retained 100 characters would correspond to the registered numeric value of 100 and the discarded characters would not correspond to the registered 100.

Even if the numeric value is a registered keyword. This numeric value is the sole basis for shortening the FERNADEZ email length. Note that every claim recited **registered keywords** and thus there must be plural keywords. The Official Action has not indicated that FERNADEZ meets this limitation.

For this reason, all of the claims previously pending are believed allowable.

Additionally, at least to claim 3, there must be disclosure of registered keywords are individual keywords including dates, place names, proper names and individually set particular terms, and group keywords including an occupation, an occupational type and an age group of an electronic mail sender and receiver.

For this further reason, claim 3 is believed allowable.

However, in the interest of advancing the case, the claims have been further amended. For example, claim 1 has been amended as follows:

the message portion of the received electronic mail comprising a string of first words that include the registered keywords and, located intermediate the first

words, second words that fail to include the registered keywords,

the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to retain the first words that include ~~text corresponding to~~ the registered keywords and to leave out the second words that fail to include ~~not corresponding to~~ the registered keywords to form the short text of the message retaining the first words and omitting the intermediate second words.

Claim 3 has been amended:

the analysis means first decomposing the message portion into words and second selectively shortening the message portion to retain first decomposed text ~~corresponding to~~ including the registered keywords and to leave out ~~words other decomposed text~~ not corresponding to the registered keywords, the other decomposed text being located within the message portion intermediate the first decomposed text.

Claim 5 has been amended:

a short text of a message portion of the electronic mail that omits intermediate words not matching the registered keywords, the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to retain text corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words not ~~corresponding~~ matching to the registered keywords and located intermediate the text corresponding to the registered keywords.

Claim 6 is amended:

the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to retain text portions corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words, intermediate the retained text portions that do not corresponding to the registered keywords.

Claim 10 is amended:

the analysis means initially decomposing the message portion and subsequently selectively shortening the decomposed message portion to retain into the short text by retaining text portions corresponding to the registered keywords and ~~to leave out~~ leaving out words not corresponding to the registered keywords and located intermediate the retaining text portions.

Claim 11 is amended:

the analysis selectively shortening the message portion to retain text corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words intermediate the retained text that are not corresponding to the registered keywords.

Claim 12 is amended:

analyzing a message portion of the received electronic mail, the analysis selectively shortening a length of the message portion ~~to retain~~ by retaining instances of text

~~corresponding to~~ including the user registered keywords and ~~to~~
~~leave out~~ leaving out words not ~~corresponding to~~ included in the
registered keywords found intermediate the retained instances of
text corresponding to the user registered keywords.

Claim 14 is amended:

first step for analyzing a message portion of
received electronic mail, the analysis i) forming a short text
by selectively shortening a length of the message portion ~~to~~
~~retain~~ retaining text corresponding to user-registered keywords
and ~~to leave~~ leaving out words located within the message portion
intermediate the retained text and not corresponding to the user-
registered keywords and ii) converting content of the short text
of the received electronic mail into voice signals.

Claim 17 has been amended:

analysis means for reading the electronic mail out of
the receive mail box and for carrying out a keyword analysis of
the readout electronic mail on the basis of keywords previously
registered by the receiver to obtain a short text of a message
portion of the electronic mail, the analysis means selectively
shortening the message portion to i) retain text portions
corresponding to the registered keywords and to ii) leave out
words located within the message portion intermediate the

retained text portions and not corresponding to the registered keywords.

Claim 18 has been amended:

analysis means for reading the received electronic mail and for carrying out a keyword analysis of the readout electronic mail on the basis of keywords previously registered by the receiver to obtain a short text of a message portion of the electronic mail shortened by omitting words within the message portion not corresponding to the registered keywords, the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to identify and retain text portions corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words located between the retained text portions and not corresponding to the registered keywords.

Claim 19 has been amended:

analysis means for reading the received electronic mail and for carrying out a keyword analysis of the readout electronic mail, on the basis of a database of keywords previously registered by the receiver, to obtain a short text of a message portion of the electronic mail,

the analysis means referring to the database for selectively shortening the message portion ~~to retain~~ by deleting words not registered as keywords and retaining text corresponding ~~to~~ portions of the message portion that include the registered

keywords ~~and~~ to leave out words ~~not corresponding to the~~
~~registered keywords~~ located within the message portion between
registered keywords.

None of the applied references are believed to teach or suggest these above-identified features.

The inventive analysis means reads the received electronic mail and carries out a keyword analysis of the readout electronic mail on the basis of keywords previously registered by the receiver to obtain a short text of a message portion of the electronic mail, the analysis means selectively shortening the message portion to retain text corresponding to the registered keywords and to leave out words not corresponding to the registered keywords.

FERNANDEZ makes no teaching as to using previously registered **keywords** as a basis for obtaining a short text of the electronic mail that retains within the short message the registered keywords but omits other words intermediate these keywords.

FERNANDEZ, specifically, page 5, lines 1-15 teaches "a system for delivering notification of e-mail ... [with] account deliver options The e-mail messages ... are in a 'summarized' form consistent with the message length limit and typically small display of a phone. [The e-mail message includes] some basic information about the messages such as the identity of the sender, ... and a truncated version of the main text."

So, FERNANDEZ also teaches filtering e-mail messages and sending a "summarized form" of the e-mail with a truncated version of the main text. The filter determines what messages get sent and not what comprises the summarized form of the sent message.

There is no teaching found that provides that the text of the email is shortened into a short text, by including the registered keywords and excluding words that are not registered keywords.

For example, there is no teaching of retaining text portions of the e-mail that include registered words relating to dates, place names, proper names and individually set particular terms, and group keywords including an occupation, an occupational type and an age group of an electronic mail sender and receiver (claim 3).

Claim 19 recites the keyword database. For support, see specification page 14, disclosing, with reference to application Figure 3, that the keyword analysis server 9 refers to the keyword database 12 storing predetermined group keywords and individual keywords and deletes some inessential words from the received e-mail while leaving the keywords, for example, dates, place names, spots, proper names and individually set particular terms such as "above-captioned case, have studied, your company, proposal, accept, contract, various conditions, qualified person, attend and so on" to prepare a short text 18.

The keyword analysis server 9 then outputs the prepared short text 18 as a keyword analyzed e-mail 17.


Thus, the invention provides a means for shortening the e-mail text such that important, i.e., registered keywords, remain in the shortened text and non-essential words are left out of the shortened text.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

REL/mjr
May 10, 2005